

SPEECH

OF

HON. T. S. HAYMOND, OF VIRGINIA,

ON THE

ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

DELIVERED

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 21, 1850.

WASHINGTON:
PRINTED AT THE CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE OFFICE.
1850.

H03812

AMERICAN COLLEGE

AMERICAN COLLEGE



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

ADMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

The House being in Committee of the Whole on state of the Union, on the President's Message transmitting the Constitution of California—

Mr. HAYMOND said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It was not my intention until within the last few weeks, to take any part in this discussion, and I should not have changed my determination if it were not that I occupy, seemingly, a position not in accordance with the popular sentiment of the people of the State of which I have the honor in part to represent.

I differ to some extent with those gentlemen from Virginia, who have addressed the House on the subject now under consideration, particularly about the action of the Executive; and representing as I do at least one tenth of the voters of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and believing that my views approximate to and with the opinions of a large majority of the people of Virginia, (not excepting the Petersburg, Richmond, and Norfolk districts,) I have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to present my views to this House and the country.

I have taken my position after the best reflection I could give this question, and expect to maintain it. And here let me take occasion to say, that my determination to vote for the admission of California, in some form, as one of the sovereign States of this Confederacy, is no new thing with me—my opinion was partly formed and made up before the assembling of this Congress, except as to the boundary of the State; and if that shall not be changed, I do not know that it will form an objection with me.

I took my stand in favor of the admission of California into the Union before the people in the canvass for a seat upon this floor, and I have neither seen nor heard anything to induce me to change my views, as then expressed; nor have I any doubt but that my course will meet the approbation of my constituency. And, sir, I should be recreant in the discharge of my duty to the people of my district, if I did not carry out in good faith the course upon this question that I marked out before them.

Sir, we have acquired this territory by conquest and by treaty, and we are bound in honor to take care of it. It is part and parcel of this Union—the people acknowledge our sovereignty over it, and our right to all the public property therein. The principal part of the inhabitants of California are

emigrants from the States of this Union. "They are bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh;" they know and appreciate their political rights; they have been schooled in our political schools, and understand the rights and privileges of American citizens as well as their brethren they have left behind them.

Sir, if the people of California, in forming their constitution, had provided for the introduction of slavery within their borders, quite a different state of things would have manifested itself here. Those gentlemen who represent on this floor the North only, would now be occupying the position of southern gentlemen who are supposed to represent the South only; and, sir, none of my southern friends would be found resisting the admission of California into the Union; nor do I believe they would have censured the President in such unmeasured terms for merely suggesting to the people of California the propriety of adopting measures to form a constitution with a view of asking to be admitted into the Union as one of the States of this Confederacy. And while on this subject I will notice some of the remarks of my colleague from the Richmond district. He says, in his speech delivered on this floor in the early part of this discussion, when speaking of the action of the Executive, "They exhibit, as I contend, Mr. Speaker, gross usurpation, on the part of the Executive, of both judicial and legislative powers." Here is a direct charge that the President has usurped and taken upon himself the legislative power of the country—a very grave charge; and what is the evidence he adduces before this House and the country to sustain and make good this charge? He quotes the following extract from a letter from Secretary Clayton to Mr. King:

"You have been selected by the President to convey to them these assurances, and especially the assurance of his firm determination, so far as his constitutional power extends, to omit nothing that may tend to promote and secure their peace and happiness. *You are fully possessed of the President's views, and can with propriety suggest to the people of California the adoption of measures best calculated to give them effect.* These measures must, of course, originate solely with themselves. *Assure them of the sincere desire of the Executive of the United States to protect and defend them in the formation of any government, republican in its character, hereafter to be submitted to Congress, which shall be the result of their own deliberate choice; but let it be at the same time distinctly understood by them that the plan of such a government must originate with themselves, and without the interference of the Executive.*

"The laws of California and New Mexico, as they existed at the conclusion of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, regulating the relations of the inhabitants with each other, will

necessarily remain in force in the Territories. Their relations with the former government have been dissolved, and new relations created between them and the Government of the United States; *but the existing laws, regulating the relations of the people with each other, will continue until others, lawfully enacted, shall supersede them.* Our naval and military commanders on these stations will be fully instructed to coöperate with the friends of order and good government, so far as their coöperation can be useful and proper."

Now, sir, here is a mere suggestion of the Secretary to the people of California, of the President's views, advising them of the necessity of consulting one with another upon the propriety of forming a State government. We had failed to do our duty in providing a civil government for the inhabitants of California, and they were thrown upon their own resources, and bound to provide a government for themselves, or live under a military government. Congress had adjourned without making any provision for the government of this territory; and under this state of things, the President says in his message, "I did not hesitate to express to the people of those Territories my desire that each Territory should, if prepared to comply with the requisitions of the Constitution of the United States, form a plan of a State constitution and submit the same to Congress, with a prayer for admission into the Union as a State; but I did not anticipate, suggest, or authorize the establishment of any government without the assent of Congress." And my colleague in substance asserts in his argument, that this recommendation, or advice, so given, was a gross usurpation, and that the President by so doing was guilty of usurping the legislative and judicial power of the country. He argues, and rightly, too, that it belonged to the legislative branch of the Government to provide for, and organize, territorial governments, and also to provide for the admission of new States into this Confederacy—a doctrine and principle that no one will or does controvert.

But because the President suggests to the people of California the propriety of forming a State government, my colleague, from this fact, and this only, asserts that he (the President) was guilty of usurpation. Strange doctrine to be advanced by so able and distinguished a lawyer, that a mere suggestion to the people, made by the way of giving advice, should be construed and declared to be an exercise of legislative power. If this is true, and he is right in his construction of what constitutes an act of legislative usurpation, then, sir, all our Presidents have, to a greater or less extent, been usurpers. President Jackson, according to the same rule of interpretation, was guilty of usurpation when he issued his memorable proclamation at the time some of the people of South Carolina were threatening to nullify and make void the laws of the United States. We all recollect the effects produced by that proclamation; the whole people approved the sentiments it contained, and the bold and patriotic stand taken by President Jackson to save the country from the pernicious effects of the doctrine of nullification. Meetings were held by the people in every portion of the country, at which meetings responses were sent up, with pledges to sustain the Administration in their efforts to maintain and enforce the laws of the United States. And I here beg leave to read to the House an extract from the message of President Jackson to Con-

gress, on the 16th day of January, 1833, having relation to the preservation of the Union of these States. The sentiments are noble, and worthy to emanate from a President of the United States:

"The rich inheritance bequeathed by our fathers has devolved upon us the sacred obligation of preserving it by the same virtues which conducted them through the eventful scenes of the Revolution, and ultimately crowned their struggle with the noblest model of civil institutions. They bequeathed to us a government of laws, and a Federal Union, founded upon the great principle of popular representation. After a successful experiment of forty-four years; at a moment when the Government and the Union are the objects of the hopes of the friends of civil liberty throughout the world; and in the midst of public and individual prosperity unexampled in history, we are called to decide whether these laws possess any force, and that Union the means of self-preservation. The decision of this question by an enlightened and patriotic people cannot be doubtful. For myself, fellow-citizens, devoutly relying upon that kind Providence which has hitherto watched over our destinies, and actuated by a profound reverence for these institutions I have so much cause to love, and for the American people whose partiality honored me with their highest trust, I have determined to spare no effort to discharge the duty which in this conjuncture is devolved upon me.

"That a similar spirit will actuate the Representatives of the American people is not to be questioned; and I fervently pray that the Great Ruler of nations may so guide your deliberations, and our joint measures, as that they may prove salutary examples, not only to the present, but to future times, and solemnly proclaim that the Constitution and the laws are supreme, and the Union indissoluble.

"ANDREW JACKSON.

"WASHINGTON, January 16, 1833."

The substance of the argument that my colleague uses to prove that the President has usurped the judicial power of the country, is, that he, through his Secretary, expressed the opinion that the laws of Mexico were, to some extent, in force in the territory acquired by conquest and treaty from the Republic of Mexico; and that this opinion, so given, would have and exercise a controlling influence with and over the judges, should this question be brought before the courts for adjudication; and that, of a consequence, the expression of such an opinion, in the manner and form in which it was done, was and is a usurpation and exercise of judicial power. Now, sir, is it true that an opinion, so expressed, was an exercise of judicial power? Will the gentleman believe it himself, when he gives the question a fair consideration? Is there any lawyer of high reputation, like he is, who is not laboring under the influence of strong excitement, and I may say prejudice, that would risk his reputation as a lawyer by a solemn and earnest expression of such an opinion?

The honorable gentleman from the Richmond district is not content with charging the President with these usurpations only; but he also charges him with having neglected to perform the duties required of him as the Executive of this nation? He says:

"The Administration has wholly transcended its simple executive functions. It has incited and aided to overthrow the *de facto* government it was bound to maintain, and to supersede all laws it was bound to enforce. It has trenchanted upon and assumed high legislative powers, the exclusive functions of Congress, its coördinate department under the Constitution."

Now, sir, what did the honorable gentleman desire the President should have done? Did he wish that, instead of advising the people of this territory to form a constitution, and present it to Congress, and apply for admission as a State into this Union, he (the President) should have resisted with the military power of the country such action, and thereby maintained by force the then

existing government *de facto*? He says, in substance, the President failed to do his duty by permitting the people of California to assemble together and consult one with another about their interests and duties as citizens of California. Sir, with all due respect for the legal qualifications of my colleague, I must be permitted to say that he has not satisfied my mind that the President has been guilty of neglect of duty, or of usurping either legislative or judicial powers, in his advice and action in relation to California; and I believe that the President will be sustained in the patriotic course he has adopted by a large majority of the people of the United States. They can and will read, understand, and appreciate the plain and straight-forward course pursued by the President; and all the special pleadings of all the lawyers in Congress, to mystify the President's message on this subject, will be of no avail.

My colleague, in speaking of the President's former life and habits, says:

"His Cabinet have been differently raised and exercised. They have been selected for their supposed maturity of wisdom and fullness of experience on such subjects. On them General Taylor would naturally rely, and by their counsels be guided in all such matters. In justice and in truth his Cabinet are responsible for the unconstitutional action, the usurpations, and insidious tendencies of the policy disclosed by that message. Such responsibility before this House and the country would I fix upon them. The consequences of his action, and the result of his policy, were surely not appreciated by the President. I much fear me, his unsuspecting honesty has been practised on—his generous confidence abused. The pretext of extending protection and encouragement to a distant community, cast mainly on Executive care, has been used to induce wide departure from his just line of duty, and serious encroachment on the coördinate departments of this Government."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the justice of my colleague, to this House, and the country, to determine whether this is not dealing ungenerously with the President, the veteran soldier, and distinguished commander of our armies, who displayed so much wisdom and good sense in all his military operations. Here, sir, is an imputation that the President does not comprehend what he is made to say and do by his Cabinet. It is the reiteration of the fulminations of the partisan presses of the country, who have been playing this game for the last twelve months. They are aware that the President has a strong hold upon the affections of the people, and that it will not do to assail his reputation; but, sir, they send out to the country intimation after intimation that the President is totally unfit for the proper discharge of the duties of his office; that he is the mere automaton in the hands of his Cabinet. And this is done for the purpose of weakening the confidence of the people in the measures and policy he recommends. I would advise my colleague to go and see General Taylor, and converse freely with him; he will find that he is not only acquainted with the history of this Government and the policy of the country, but that his mind is stored with useful information. I have been but very little with the President, but I have each time left him with increased confidence of the purity of his heart, of his good sound common sense, and of his superior fitness for the duties of the office he fills with so much dignity to himself and advantage to the country. And, sir, the very argument of the honorable gentleman, if it proves anything, proves that candidates for the Presidency, and Presidents after election, should not be forward to commit

themselves as to their constitutional duties and powers, and that, therefore, Zachary Taylor, in the late canvass, acted right in not pledging himself in advance, either to veto or give his assent to any particular bill that might be passed by Congress. And our present trouble upon this slavery question has mainly resulted from the fact that a different course has been pursued by at least one of his predecessors.

I have said that I expected to vote for the admission of California into the Union as one of the sovereign States of this mighty Confederacy, without any limitation upon the rights of her people, except that prescribed by the Constitution of the United States. I acknowledge, and believe in the doctrine, that the people of this country are capable of self-government, and that when any portion of the people are about to form a State government, and ask for admittance into the Union of these States, that they have the right to provide for the regulation of their own domestic affairs, and to determine whether they will or will not tolerate slavery within their limits; and I call upon the friends of political and civil liberty, to unite with me in asserting this doctrine. And, sir, let me exhort our friends from the North to abandon their *Wilmot proviso*, and all other unjust, unconstitutional, or inexpedient limitations upon the rights of the inhabitants of the territories of the United States. Their application, it is believed by them, will have no practical effect; and if they have the numerical force, and, as they seem to believe, the constitutional power, yet still they ought not to exercise it, because it will be calculated to alienate the feelings and destroy that harmony that it is so essential should exist between the people of the different sections of this Confederacy. Let us recollect that we all belong to the same great family, and that we should not only avoid doing any act of injustice one towards another, but that we should avoid anything that is offensive. And, sir, let me beg that gentlemen will look to the country as it is, and legislate for it as it is; we have slaves in the South, and they must, for a long time to come, continue to be slaves. Why speak of this state of things, when discussing this subject, in a reproachful manner to the South? Why will you pursue a course that can be of no practical benefit, and one too, that can have no other tendency but to produce sectional jealousy and sectional action? Mr. Chairman, the doctrine of non-intervention in relation to the territories, is the only principle that can stand the test of public scrutiny in this free country. Let our brethren of the South and the North unite in asserting this principle, and all will yet be well with us. I call upon the good and the patriotic from the South and the North to come together upon this platform that is common for all, and that is good for all. It suits the North upon the question of admitting California; it will suit the South in the organization of the territorial governments, if any should be organized. It will leave the people of the territories free to determine, when they form a constitution, and ask to be admitted into the Union, whether involuntary slavery shall be tolerated in their State. Let us who love the Union abjure both northern and southern fanatics, if any such there be.

Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen have spoken of the origin of political abolition, and fixed its commencement at the beginning of this controversy

about the organization of this newly-acquired territory into territorial governments; but I date it back to 1835, when Mr. Van Buren was induced, by the desire of office and the pressure of some of his southern friends, to pledge himself in advance, if he should be elected President of these United States, to veto any bill that Congress should pass having for its object the abolition of slavery in this District. It was this pledge that gave vitality to political abolition. It was this pledge that caused him to be designated as the northern man with southern principles. In addition to this, southern editors of newspapers who favored his election, lauded him for giving this pledge, and treated those who would not make a like pledge as unworthy of confidence and support. These were the original causes of the introduction of political abolition into our elections; and, sir, this political abolition has been nurtured and strengthened by those editors of political newspapers who estimated success in a party struggle for power and patronage for their friends of more importance than they did the interest, the honor, and the glory of our country.

President-making has contributed largely to bring about the present state of things. We have for some years witnessed a continual struggle, by the friends of the presidential aspirants, to obtain for their candidates the abolition vote of the North; and we have seen partisan editors in the South rejoice over a victory obtained in congressional elections by the aid of abolition votes, and we have witnessed here this winter the bitter fruits of such victories. We have learned by the newspapers that one of these political victories came off in Connecticut the other day; and we had a demonstration, since that victory, made by the ex-governor of that State on this floor, which southern gentlemen cannot approve. We shall see, however, whether he will be denounced for his ultra-abolition speech with the same seemingly indignant feeling that has been manifested toward the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STEVENS] by our friends on this and the other side of this Hall.

Mr. Chairman, I am sometimes led to believe that this excitement and unfortunate state of things has been partly brought about, and fanned almost into a flame of discord and disunion, for party purposes. I sometimes fear that there are those who are looking on with intense anxiety for the approach of a crisis that will bring us to the very verge of revolution, and who may hope, at the time that they have partly succeeded in producing revolution and bloodshed, to stand in a position that will enable them to take hold of the helm of State and arrest the storm, and present themselves to the people as the deliverers of the country. Sir, power is sweet; and men who have long been used to think and act as though the Government was instituted for their especial benefit, dislike to be despoiled of what they seem to think is their prescriptive right; and to obtain power and place they are willing to risk and jeopardize our glorious Union. If there are any who occupy this position, the people, who are ever watchful, will not indulge them. No, sir; our people want good government, and no factions; and they are devotedly attached to the Union. And, sir, there never was a more true remark uttered upon this floor than that uttered by my friend from North Carolina, when he said that there were Virginians enough here in this city, holding office, (only about

sixty,) to defeat and put to rout in the battle-field, all the disunionists now at this time in Virginia.

One word as to the Nashville Convention and a Southern Confederacy. I am satisfied that there is not a sane man in northwest Virginia who desires the erection of a southern confederacy. No, sir; the people bordering upon the Ohio river and upon the Pennsylvania line, will not only oppose a division by Mason and Dixon's line, but they will resist it until their everlasting hills shall be desolated, and their valleys shall stream with blood. Sir, it is time to speak out, and I shall do so without fear, regardless of the taunts and frowns of any man or set of men. The Representative of the fourteenth district of Virginia and myself represent the western border of the talked of new confederacy, from the Kentucky line to the northwest corner of the State of Maryland, bounding on the Ohio river and the Pennsylvania line. Our constituents would have to do all the fighting on the western border; the South would have as much as they could do to take care of the Atlantic coast, and protect their peculiar domestic property. Sir, during the war of 1812 with Great Britain, western Virginians marched to the sea-board by thousands, to aid in defending the property and homes of their eastern brethren. They did so without a murmur, and they would do so again if the necessity should arise, for they are Virginians all over. But, sir, when they shall be called upon to raise their hands against our Union, which act they believe will destroy, in its course, their liberties and of a consequence desolate the fairest portion of Virginia, they will cry, "Hold! hands off, gentlemen! We are your brethren and friends, but we cannot and will not enlist in a crusade that will, in our opinion, destroy the Government erected by our Washingtons, our Jeffersons, and our Madisons. We are not going to commit ourselves to a suicidal policy that is to lay waste in its ravages our country, without any hopes of a corresponding benefit.

Sir, we do not intend to give up the free navigation of our noble river, that washes the shores of twelve States of this Union. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Monongahela river, one of the main branches of the Ohio, is navigable one hundred miles south of Mason and Dixon's line; there is at least one hundred thousand free white people living upon its waters in Virginia, and the trade on this river is of as much value and importance as that of any river in the State of Virginia. Sir, it is not worth while for us of northwestern Virginia to speak of our love and fealty for our good old Commonwealth—we all love her, and we are all ready to aid in advancing her interests and her glory; but we will not, for any cause that now exists, engage in a contest that is to utterly destroy, in our opinion, the fairest portion of her territory, and to bury in their ruins her most enterprising citizens. We have faith in the people of Virginia, both east and west—we believe that at least three-fourths of the people of Virginia think with us, and that among the masses of our people there is no want of loyalty to this Union.

As to the Nashville Convention, there will be no representative sent there from my section of the State. Though gilded with the profession that one of its objects is to consult about how the Union shall be preserved, it is believed by the people to be conceived in sin, and that the design of its zeal-

ous friends and originators was and is disunion, and they have already given it the appellation of Hartford Convention No. 2.

Sir, the effort to get up meetings to send delegates to the Nashville Convention, has been almost an entire failure in Virginia. The friends of that convention have been generally rebuked by the people wherever they have been called together in large numbers for the purpose of providing for sending delegates to this convention. Richmond, Petersburg, Norfolk, and the great county of Albemarle, (the home of Mr. Jefferson,) have repudiated it. The northwest are as one man against it. The friends of the Union of these States need have no fear of Virginia; she is always foremost in deeds of patriotism; she has made more sacrifices for the Union than any other State in this Confederacy, and has a deep and abiding interest in its preservation. Passing out of my own State into North Carolina, we find there the same manifestations—the old North State repudiates the Nashville Convention; so with Tennessee—the people of Nashville decline to participate in its deliberations.

Sir, I have no fear that any serious evil would follow the admission of California. If any difficulty shall arise, it will grow out of the effort to establish territorial governments for New Mexico and Utah. If you should fail in that effort, or if you should pass bills to that effect with the slavery prohibition, I should deeply regret it, and should have some apprehension for the safety of the country,—not that I believe that any practical injury would be done to the southern States, for I have no idea that you will ever have a population in any of those territories that will tolerate slavery in their midst,—but, sir, it would have something of the appearance of excluding those persons who hold slaves from these territories, and would enable those who have for years been calculating the value of the Union to increase the excitement. But if you can establish territorial governments for these territories without saying anything about slavery, leaving the question whether slavery shall or shall not be tolerated, to be determined by those who may migrate to and settle those territories, it will go far to put down ultraism in both sections of the Union. Sir, I am satisfied that there are conservative men enough in this House to settle this question satisfactorily to the country, if they can act together as they should do; but with some gentlemen party and the promotion of party interests, seem to be everything.

The great desideratum with some gentlemen seems to be to determine how, and in what manner, they shall entrap the President; what course of policy is best for them to pursue to enable them present him in an odious light to the people. They get up here full of patriotism, manifesting a disposition to make great sacrifices for the Union, protesting that party feelings should have nothing to do with the settling of this question; and in the next moment they pounce upon the President, and denounce him and his friends with a bitterness unparalleled in this country. Sir, this question cannot be settled by denunciations of the Whig or Democratic party. If settled satisfactorily to the country, it must and will be done by the conservative men of the two great parties. It cannot be settled by attempting to destroy the character and reputation of the staid and distinguished man

now at the head of the Government. Gentlemen here from the South, who manifest a disposition to make party capital by this discussion, charge the President with advocating and lending the influence of his position to the advancement of northern views and northern policy; while the abolitionists charge him and his Cabinet, with being actuated by, and influenced with, a desire to promote the interests of what they are pleased to denominate the aristocracy of slavery.

Sir, I repeat that you cannot settle this question by multiplying denunciations upon the head of the veteran patriot and soldier now occupying the chief executive chair—the man who has been elected by the free and spontaneous voice of the American people without an effort on his part—he who entered the army as a lieutenant, and fought himself up to the highest military office known to the Government, and who has been elevated to the most exalted political position occupied by any living man, over the heads not only of all the eminent statesmen in this country, but also over the heads of the trading politicians of the country.

This question cannot be settled by heaping abusive epithets upon the non-slaveholding part of the community; nor can it be satisfactorily settled by denunciation of slaveholders. I take it for granted, that gentlemen who pursue this course, are influenced by a desire to produce sectional strife and sectional jealousy, with a view to ultimate disunion. Their action will certainly have that tendency: it can in no event have any good effect.

The plan submitted by the President was approved at the time by a large majority of the people; they looked upon it as less objectionable than any proposition that had been presented to the country, and a plan that could and would be acquiesced in by the people, both at the North and the South. The members of Congress had been assembled here, and trying to organize for weeks, but without success—we could not even elect a Doorkeeper nor a Postmaster. You had here no great party that would act together; everything seemed to be thrown into chaos and confusion. At last we elected a Speaker, and then a Clerk; and then came the President's annual message, and a little after, his California message. His recommendations disarmed, to a very considerable extent, the abolitionists, and joy seemed to beam on the countenances of members, when they were enabled to place themselves on the platform of the President, and by their votes pronounce the death-knell of the Wilmot proviso.

It was a Buena Vista victory, and in character with the glorious old chief who has so often led his countrymen to victory.

Mr. Chairman, I have found on my desk a printed letter, purporting to be an address of ALBERT G. BROWN to his constituents, speaking of the President's agents and spies sent to California, which agents and spies he intimates produced the action taken by the people of California in convention; and he attempts, by inference, to fix upon the President a fraud, which he says was successfully practiced upon the people of California. He would have his constituents to believe that General Taylor, by some kind of legerdemain, caused the clause prohibiting slavery to be inserted in the constitution formed by the people of California for their government. Sometimes we are told the

President is weak and almost an imbecile; again it is intimated that he is a great manager, and that he so arranges his matters that he leaves no tracks behind him so that he can be followed, and that his manifold misdeeds cannot be demonstrated by any facts they can bring to light. I have no doubt but that Santa Anna also found him hard to head.

Does the honorable gentleman believe that his insinuations and inferences, published in a letter directed to his constituents but first exhibited her to the Washington public, will carry with it such force that he will be able to fix upon General Taylor fraud, duplicity, and falsehood?

If he does, he deceives himself; but he will have the consolation to know that it is not the first time he has suffered himself to be deceived; for if I mistake not he informed us here that he had been taken in with General Cass's Nicholson letter; that he had given that letter a different construction from that which General Cass give it himself,

and I believe a construction that no person gave it except the honorable gentleman from Mississippi. And I have no doubt it will be so with this letter; no man who searches for truth, and the truth only, will, without better evidence than that letter carries with it, come to the same conclusions with its author.

Old Zach has heard too many cannons roar to be killed off by flashes upon paper, or to be alarmed by efforts of this character. And however exalted may be the character of the honorable gentleman, and great his influence, if I am not very much mistaken, he will find that this effort to induce his constituents to believe that General Taylor has so far lost sight of his fame and his character that he is capable of descending to trickery, fraud, and falsehood, to procure the insertion of the Wilmot proviso in the constitution of California, will prove an utter failure, and be rebuked by the people.